DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 288 SP 037 567

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Gates, Gordon S. |
| TITLE | Faculty's Perception and Use of Emotion To Instruct: Emotional Management and Socialization in the Classroom. |
| PUB DATE | 1997-00-00 |
| NOTE | 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997). |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Affective Behavior; Body Language; *Classroom Environment; *College Faculty; College Students; Constructivism (Learning); Higher Education; Social Influences; *Socialization; Student Behavior; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Methods |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Emotions |

ABSTRACT

A group of nine tenured faculty members at a university on the Pacific Coast of the United States participated in this study that examined their use of emotion in instruction. The mixed gender group was ethnically diverse and included representatives from several departments. Observations of lectures focused on the faculty members' body movements, location in the classroom, and dialogue, and on the expressiveness of their language. Interviews attempted to clarify what the researcher had seen during the observations. Data analysis pointed to the faculty's problem of not giving adequate attention to the affective experience of students' socialization. Faculty members were found to be focused largely on the rational: they viewed emotions as biological, disruptive, anti-rational, inadequate for knowing, and leading to poor decisions or irrational behavior. Their perspective of affect oriented their attention to the rational experience of the students, to the exclusion of students' emotional encounters in the classroom. This view discounts emotions as an important source of information and a critical component of the socialization involved in becoming self-directed. These findings indicate that the view of the nonemotional as being equivalent to the rational is inadequate as is the complete acceptance of unhindered emotional expression. (Contains 47 references.) (SM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 413 288

# Faculty's perception and use of emotion to instruct:

# Emotional management and socialization in the classroom

**Dr. Gordon S. Gates**

**Washington State University**

**Paper presented at AERA '97**

**Chicago, Illinois**

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. S. Gates

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

S183567

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Introduction

Literature on higher education frequently discusses the need for professors to instruct in ways which attend to students' cognitive, moral, and affective growth (Adams, 1976; Brookfield, 1990; Davis, 1993; Grow, 1991; Lowman, 1984; Mann, et al., 1970; Perry, 1970; Wilshire, 1990; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993). Student socio-emotional development is posited as one of the primary purposes of postsecondary education (Astin, 1992; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). The literature forwards models of instruction and learning that contain advise, set goals, and provide frameworks to assist the faculty in facilitating student socio-emotional development.

For example, part of Grow's (1991) definition of self-directed learning states, self-directed learners "examine themselves, their culture, and their milieu in order to understand how to separate what they feel from what they should feel, what they value from what they should value, and what they want from what they should want" (p. 133). Kegan (1994) sees this "wrenching of the self from its cultural surround"(p. 275), which occurs as part of becoming self-directed, as emotionally painful. Others have also discussed the pain and discomfort that students experience as they become critically self-reflective and begin to challenge their taken-for-granted ways of knowing and being (Crooks, 1995; Brookfield, 1990; Fried, 1993; Meacham, 1995; Momeyer, 1995; Wilshire, 1990). Recommendations are offered to the faculty for helping students cope with discomfort and anxiety, as well as counsel on how to increase student love of learning and decrease student boredom. However, the assumptions and advise forwarded by one scholar often contradict those of another.

Brookfield (1990), who has written extensively on self-directed learning and instruction in higher education, argues that faculty should acknowledge, attend, allow, and assist student

expression and exploration of feelings. Brookfield rejects the view that the emotional is disruptive to the rational, and thus discourages faculty efforts at neutralizing their own and student emotion. Wilshire (1990) supports such a position. In contrast, Chickering and Reisser (1993) state, "[t]he problem with some emotions is that they seem to crop up unexpectedly and confound all of our hard work and planning" (p. 84). Crooks (1995), Fried (1995), and Lowman (1984) share this position. The expression of strong and/or negative emotion by either faculty or students is portrayed as potentially damaging to learning processes. The use and value of emotion in the classroom is questioned. The discrepancy between these two positions is substantive and suggests the subject needs further study.

One avenue of investigation that has not been explored involves identifying faculty's perception and use emotion to instruct and encourage student cognitive, moral, and affective development. The purpose of this paper is to provide description, analysis, and interpretation of an investigation that attempted to explore the faculty's use of emotion in instruction. The study offers insights on emotion as a social rather than psychological construct to clarify and contribute to the current debate.

## Theoretical Framework

There is an emerging body of scholarship that gives attention to emotions as cognitive and social rather than as biological and psychological, the traditional and dominant perspective (Averill, 1980; Denzin, 1984; Hochschild, 1983; Mead, 1964; Rosaldo, 1984; Shott, 1979; Solomon, 1976; Thoits, 1989; Tavris, 1989). The basic building blocks of this constructionist paradigm of emotions follows. In Thoits' (1989) recent review of the sociology of emotion, a

definition of emotion is absent. Instead, the elements of a definition are provided. Specifically, she states "emotions involve: (a) appraisals of a situational stimulus or context, (b) changes in physiological or bodily sensations, (c) the free or inhibited display of expressive gestures, and (d) a cultural label applied to specific constellations of one or more of the first three components" (p. 318). Denzin (1983) offers the following definition of emotion, which has embedded in its conceptualization these four aspects: "emotions are temporally embodied self-feelings which arise from emotional social acts persons direct to self or have directed towards them by others" (p. 404). In other words, emotions are largely identified, constructed, defined, and lived through reflected appraisals derived from "other taking" (Denzin, 1990). They are intersubjective (Denzin, 1984; Mead, 1964; Solomon, 1976). McCarthy (1989) states, "emotions are part of the conscious relations, actions, and experiences of selves. Emotions are not 'inside' our bodies but rather actions we place in our world. . . . [F]eelings are social, that is they are constituted and sustained by group processes" (pp. 56-57). People experience emotion largely in terms of a symbolic ordering established by the society in which they live. Society offers individuals language, norms, customs, attitudes, values, skills, technologies, myths, etc., by which they define what is occurring in a given situation, label what it is they have identified as occurring, structure how they should feel about what is happening in the situation, and codify how they should behave in that situation. People are socialized to experience emotion.

For example, Averill (1980) discusses emotions as transitory social roles. Applying the concept of roles—normatively defined ways of acting in a given situation—to feelings, Averill's work draws attention to the management of emotion. The management of the emotional experience, both felt and displayed, has been a central contribution to our understanding of affect

by those of the constructionist school of thought. A leading figure in this research has been Hochschild (1983, 1989). A notable amount of research has followed on emotional management in the work place (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987; Sutton, 1991; Tolich, 1993; Wharton, 1993). Hochschild articulates two forms of emotional management: emotional work (the private management of emotion) and emotional labor (the management of emotion in employment). Both involve surface acting and deep acting. Surface acting is the conscious altering of outward expressions to conform to emotional rules. Such changes alter emotional perception. Deep acting goes further and involves the changing of the experience of feelings. Hochschild identifies three forms of deep acting; the conscious effort at redefining the situation, changing the body state (i.e., exercise or deep breathing), and visualizing appropriate responses and self talking.

The constructionist anthropological literature conceives of emotions not as separate or opposite to the rational, but as enmeshed. Solomon (1976, 1980) makes the strong claim for emotions being judgments, "rational and purposive rather than irrational and disruptive, are very much like actions, and that we choose an emotion much as we choose a course of action" (1980, pp. 251-252). However, Goleman's (1995) most recent overview of the literature on emotion from a psychological perspective presents new evidence in brain research which weakens Solomon's position.

Brain researchers have found evidence of two pathways through which the emotional system operates. Basically, one pathway involves the sensory organs to the thalamus to the neocortex, where conscious, cognitive thinking occurs, and then to the amygdala for a generalized emotional response to the stimulus, while the second is a short cut from the thalamus

to the amygdala, bypassing the neocortex. If information is transmitted by the second pathway, it is the memories and images stored in the amygdala that set the stage for feeling and behavior. However, the neocortex does become involved later in the process.

While Goleman's (1995) discussion may reduce the strong claim for emotions being rational, as some emotions begin with the unconscious, he turns the relationship between emotion and reason on its head, and argues that in order to be rational, the emotional must be attended. He states, "The old paradigm held an ideal of reason freed from the pull of emotion. The new paradigm urges us to harmonize head and heart" (p. 29). A similar argument is made by Jacobs (1994). Goleman cites several studies where people whose brains are damaged in areas used to process emotions are unable to act rationally. Emotions are the primary mechanism for guiding judgments, as emotions provide standards for assessing other social objects, events, and agents (Denzin, 1984; Goleman, 1995; Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988; Solomon, 1976). As McCarthy (1989) states so eloquently, "Emotion is a fundamental social category, a mold for our mental lives. Emotions themselves are objects we handle and seek in that contemporary drama of the self" (p. 69). Thus, humans as actor must not only experience emotion but attend to their emotions to behave rationally or in appropriate ways defined as rational.

## Methodology

Nine tenured faculty members were selected to participate in the study and were chosen for the diversity in the faculty that they represent. Men and women faculty were identified in the hard science and mathematics, social sciences and humanities, and the professional schools. Ethnic diversity was also included as African American and Latino faculty were invited to participate in the study. These nine faculty were interviewed and observed for fourteen weeks

over a five month period as they taught their undergraduate courses at Inland State University[1], a mid-sized, residential university campus off the Pacific coast of the United States.

Data for this study was collected using a field research methodology (Johnson, 1975; Lofland & Lofland, 1995; Wolcott, 1995). Observations of lectures focused on the faculty member's body movements, location in the classroom, and dialogue, as well as the expressiveness of their language. Field notes were taken using the semitranscription technique. Christensen, Garvin, and Sweet (1991) describe this method as providing,

> rich data for observer and instructor to analyze. In this method, the observer makes rapid notes that capture various aspects of the process at key moments—how things look, sound, and even feel at specific points in the discussion. . . . Semitranscription notes can also address the pace and emotional atmosphere, and add the observer's running comments. (p. 221).

In addition, throughout several lectures, what professors and students did and said was recorded using systematic observations, much like a "time and motion" study (Wolcott, 1994).

Developed from a review of emerging literature, the initial analytical framework which guided the study contained categories and relationships between constructs which were general and acted in a sensitizing capacity. The initial interview questionnaires were developed from this framework. These interviews generally lasted for one hour, but several continued on for an additional half hour—these faculty were very willing to talk about their teaching experiences and views of undergraduate education. All interviews were tape-recorded for later transcription. Subsequent interviews which occurred throughout the study were less structured and less intensive. Most involved short discussions as the faculty member and I walked across the campus after class. In these conversations I attempted to clarify what I had observed in class. The data analysis which began immediately after my first few days in the field developed into

1. Pseudonyms are used to protect individual and institutional identifies.

conclusions that I took back to several of the faculty. This act of member checking helps establish the trustworthiness of the analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Data collection resulted in 2,500 pages of field notes and transcriptions of interviews for analysis. As the study progressed, the overlapping processes of gathering, focusing, and analyzing data shifted from one of primarily gathering to an analyzing emphasis (Lofland & Lofland, 1985). Thus the study used a funneling process described by Spradley (1980). Additionally, theoretical memos were kept to structure and aid the analysis of collected information (Strauss, 1987). Transcripts and field notes were read and re-read and then coded according to categories that emerged from the data rather than theory (Miles & Haberman, 1984). Coding reduced data, allowed it to be displayed and conclusions drawn based on identified regularities and patterns. Through using the strategy of constant comparative, properties of the concepts were accumulated as they occurred across time, participants, settings, and technique for gathering data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Credibility is established in this study through the use of the following strategies: triangulation, member debriefing, prolonged engagement, and persistent observation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Finally, through using multiple contexts, informants, sources, and analytical tools a dense theoretical model emerged (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1994).

## Participants

David Bishop teaches humanities, general education and honors courses at ISU. He is an older gentleman, in his late fifties, graying hair and wears thick spectacles. His European American roots originate in the mid-West, but he considers the college town where ISU is located his home. He has a personal library in his large office which is extensive and most impressive, an accumulation of some thirty years of reading and researching. In his own words,

he is a generalist and a humanist. Following in this academic tradition, David studies human societies using an approach that retains much of the flavor of the great scholars of the Renaissance, augmented by eclectically borrowing from the social sciences. The course that I observed him teach was an upper division class of thirty students.

Felix Sanchez is also an older gentleman. However unlike David, Felix's position on the faculty is a fourth career. After listening to a brief life history, I could not help but view Felix as a modern "Renaissance man." There is little that he has not done. With a mind that is active, critical and skeptical, he finds that when he shares his extensive knowledge with others (i.e., students), he is often seen as being hard nosed. Yet as one listens, one hears only the desire to help others improve. Felix's academic mentors were postmodernists, a philosophy he attempts to model for his students who enroll in his humanities courses at ISU. His conflict oriented philosophy emphasizes a persona which intimidates students, especially when he unforgivingly points out issues related to privilege and power. Fluent in several languages, Felix, a Latino, often shares with students insights about language that can only be appreciated by multi-linguists. I observed Felix teach his large (ninety students) introductory course on personal narrative.

Kim Gardner's social scientific training was much influenced by the dialogue on postmodernism and feminism. I observed Kim using much drama in her body movements as she lead the twenty-five students enrolled in the upper division class on social inequality. Kim was recently nominated for a teaching award and has received several grants for her work on redesigning educational programs and offerings in her field of study. Kim is European American, but includes in her research specialization work on the organization of African American communities.

Eliza Montgomery is a colorful person: she possesses a vibrant personality, keen intellect and is dynamically cosmopolitan in style. Eliza is—what some might call—charismatic. Teaching in one of ISU's three professional schools, Eliza is a feminist. She is also European American, but received much of her education abroad. Her studies and travels in Europe and

Asia were often shared with the design students. The eighty student upper division course on modern design, that she teaches every other semester, was observed during this study.

Paula Eggars describes herself as a conservative and shy person. However, when you attend her large (two hundred and fifty student) introductory class on the human body you would never know it. A mother of three, Paula tells stories about her children and their development to add to the learning experience. Paula uses computer technology in many innovative ways. A textbook which she wrote is used nationwide and has been recently augmented by a CD which she developed to assist students in learning and assessing important aspects of their own lifestyles. Applied learning is an important quality of this course offered in another of ISU's professionally oriented colleges. Paula's ethnicity is European American, she was born and raised on the East Coast and still retains a slight ascent even though she has been living off the Pacific coast for the past decade.

Nathan Nealy is the third member whose home department is in one of the professional schools. Nathan has much experience and many connections in the state, region, and national business communities which he draws on for illustrating the concepts raised in his classes. He also uses his connections to help his students find employment after graduation. Educated in the Southern United States, Nathan who is African American, has a very pragmatic approach to education. I observed Nathan teaching his small (twenty-five student) upper level business management course. Humorous, empathetic, and authoritative (in the sense of being highly versed on a subject) are ways that best describe this middle aged professor.

John Wheeler is also African American. He is a professor who prides himself on encouraging and making science understandable for many of ISU's students who have previously been turned off by science education. John's devotion to students is reflected in his multiple efforts at improving science education at both local and state levels in the K-12 system. He possesses a systemic view of education, seeing the many ways K-12, university, and society are interconnected. I observed John teaching an introductory level science seminar. The twenty

students in the class were also enrolled in a lab under John's supervision. The seminar provided a forum where aspects of the lab assignments could be discussed. And John uses a lot of discussion, instigated by his questions, to prod his students into engaging with the material and processes of scientific investigation. Student questions are frequently responded to with questions in return, which helps students reframe the problem and identify a beginning place for arriving at possible solutions. In such efforts John seemed to always wear a smile and his eyes appeared in that knowing way that was reassuring and caring.

Peter Burgess is the second faculty member who participated in the study who teaches in the mathematics and science college. Peter, a European American from the South, conveys an image that is physically imposing. He possesses a voice that matches his physical presence. These skills were developed from years of lecturing in front of classes with student enrollments larger than three hundred: I observed Peter teach his large lower division science course. A performer, story-teller, and encyclopedia on scientific facts, the seventy-five minute classes always passed quickly. Yet Peter feels much frustration with the lack of contact with the students that such a large class imposes. His movements around the large hall and eye contact with students reflect his attempts to reach out to the students.

Judi McKenna teaches her courses in the mathematics and science college using a constructivist paradigm. Instead of lecturing at students, Judi has developed a program of teaching her students by having them answer questions. She has students identify where in the assigned readings they experienced difficulties in understanding and doing problems. She then has the class work through these problems as she guides them in applying the principles of math and science that they were to have learned. Students are often asked to come up to the front of the class and solve problems or work in small groups to solve problems. Despite the limitations of a large class, about one hundred and twenty students were enrolled, there is a great deal of interaction between the professor and students, and among the students themselves. A feminist,

Judi is very involved in the efforts at ISU to address issues related to the advancement and inclusion of women in sciences, mathematics, and engineering. Judi is European American.

## Management of Emotion

### Managing Expression

> It's very difficult. One on one they're all wonderful. But when you have four hundred and fifty people and you have twenty of them that are not interested and not tracking, twenty people who are not with you who have their own little thing going on, that's a major disruption. Sometimes I give them a little lecture, "If you don't want to be here that's okay, but don't interrupt other people. People are paying good money to be here. You have no right to..." I'll give them that little spiel and sometimes that works. For the most part, they're very good, but there are some days when they are very bad. I try to be humorous about it.
>
> (Paula Eggars)

Paula tries to be humorous about student behavior she finds disruptive, but she does not feel that it is humorous. Paula tries to be humorous because she believes showing her irritation or anger would not improve student behavior, but might even result in more disruptions to the class. Anger, irritation, and frustration were frequently mentioned as emotions which were felt but not displayed when teaching or interacting with students. These emotions were masked by the display of other emotions such as humor or by using actions and statements which convey emotional neutrality. For example, faculty reported that they experience feelings of irritation, even anger, when students create disturbances by being tardy, by talking to each other when they should be listening, and by leaving class early without giving notice to the professors.

As I observed classes, I witnessed only a few situations where faculty's expression was clearly one of anger. These episodes were brief and usually directed at specific students. Most often faculty members' faces were flushed, eyes glared at those who were acting deviant and they raised or lowered their voices from their normal range. For example, John was using the overhead to show his students how to set-up a data chart. Noticing several puzzled faces, he turned around and saw that the image projected by the overhead was not focused. In a sharp tone and with raised voice he said, "Hey, if you can't see this—if it is fuzzy to you—I'm looking at you—you need to tell me. Don't just sit there twiddling your thumbs." His hand, gripping the

marker, formed a fist which shook as he talked. He was clearly not happy. He abruptly stopped speaking and moving his hand back to his side, looked at the students for a few seconds expressing with eyes and furled eyebrows his displeasure with their indifference. The professor's eyes shifted from face to face searching for indications that his point had been made. He then looked at the projection of the overhead, focused the image, looked at the screen, gathered his thoughts and former composure and returned to his previous commentary. The total time duration of this brief episode was several minutes.

Faculty try to manage not only their expression of emotions like anger, but also other emotions typically thought of as being negative. In an interview with Judi, she commented that she hides her feelings of disappointment with the students when they fail to meet her expectations, such as when they do not do their readings, assigned problems, or contribute to class discussion. By hiding her disappointment, Judi is managing the expression of her emotion.

> One thing that I have to guard against because I take it so seriously and I get so wrapped up in it myself is if I'm really disappointed I have to really guard against showing that in class. Because it often works against what you're trying to accomplish. You have to show the faith in the students even when perhaps your faith in them has been shaken a little bit. You have to keep that faith and not show them you're disappointed or discouraged. (Judi McKenna)

Eliza, and many of the others also discussed managing the expression of their emotions to hide feelings of boredom, depression, and anxiety.

> Now my years as a yoga teacher taught me this more than anything. I have to put aside my own weariness, my own emotional ups and downs when I go to the classroom. I'm very aware, certainly everybody has moods and swings and all of that, but in that sense it's always a performance. I feel like I always have to put aside my own personal stuff. If there were something major, I wouldn't hesitate to express deep sorrow about something or maybe great joy, but for the most part the regular vicissitudes of life, they stay here when I go to the classroom. I try to be fully present there. If I'm feeling blue on a given day, it's the surest way to have a flat—to communicate that kind of down energy. In my mind it's the surest way to get the class to be kind of down. (Eliza Montgomery)

The display of enthusiasm or energy for the topic even when faculty do not feel enthusiastic either because they are feeling "blue" or the subject for that lecture is one that does not excite them, necessitates that faculty use surface acting. In either case these faculty claim that the expression of enthusiasm is the desired emotion that they try to express to the students.

In all of these descriptions and examples presented above faculty have or experience emotions which for various reasons they feel they should not express (e.g., anger) or they feel that another emotion other than the one that they are feeling is more appropriate (e.g., enthusiasm). In both cases faculty are generally not engaged in changing the feelings they are experiencing, rather they are acting in ways which display the appropriate emotion or in ways which do not display the feelings they label as inappropriate. It is with varying degrees of success these faculty attempt to present a different emotion, a different self-feeling, to the students and also to themselves. This management of the expression of emotion, surface acting, is performance. But, it is not the only technique that faculty use to manage their emotion.

**Managing Feeling**

In an interview Peter discussed how one semester he blew-up at a student after the class had been rude to a guest lecture. He usually avoided looking at this student because the student irritated him. Peter could not exactly say what it was about this student which irritated him, other than that the student did not do anything in class besides sit there and sometimes read the newspaper. The student also had an aura, a look of defiance. This student was not a poor student according to Peter, he got a "B+" in the class, but neither was he a good student. Peter defined good students in the following way.

> By good students, I don't necessarily mean the "A" students. I mean the students that are here for a reason and they pay attention and they do what is expected of them. (Peter Burgess)

Peter expects, as do the other faculty, that students will act in a mature manner and take responsibility for learning. The self-directed learner or a student who behaves in ways that conform to the model of self-directedness is the good student. Students who are not self-directed are frustrating to Peter.

> Either they are what I call playing grab-ass or it's their sort of aura that I find very irritating. I don't deal very well with it. I don't expect it. I get very frustrated. I worry about having these students get under my skin. And I haven't found a very good way of dealing with it. (Peter Burgess)

"And I haven't found a very good way of dealing with it" is Peter's way of saying that he doesn't believe that his management of his feelings is very effective. Peter does not like to feel frustrated with students and he regretted his actions and words spoken in anger at the student. Currently, Peter contemplates moving to a smaller, more elite institution, where classes are smaller and conducive to closer interaction with students. Peter finds that smaller classes are a more learning friendly environment.

Other faculty talked about how they manage their feelings. The emphasis in the following statements is on the ways and means faculty use to alter their felt emotions. This is the work of deep acting.

> Well I suppose everything from just take one deep breath to just psychologically prepare myself. I haven't done years of yoga for nothing. That inner training to attend to the moment is... something one learns and feels and does. I don't know if I can explain it further. (Eliza Montgomery)

> I try to give them the benefit of the doubt. I remember the young man who about five or six years ago came in after he had failed the first exam miserably. It was awful. There was something different about him though, he was real sincere when he came in and it was obvious that he wasn't looking for a quick fix. I talked to him about a process called concept mapping. I think it is really useful, particularly in this field where there's lots of terminology, etc. Anyway, he wasn't doing very well in any of his classes. We spent some time talking about it and he went home and he did it. And he came back a week later and he said, "How's this?" And I said, "That looks great. Let me make a couple of suggestions." A concept map is your own thing. But I said, "Did you think about this or think about that?" Well, he did it all the way through the semester. It was fun to watch him take exams because you could see him going through his concept map in his mind. You could see it in his eyes. He got perfect scores on all the exams after that. He visited me periodically after that. He graduated from ISU with honors. When he walked away, for me that was a tremendous reward because according to him, I had an impact. And that's what I try to focus on.
> (Peter Burgess)

> I'm just not somehow able to help students who are unprepared for college, who don't have the reading, writing, and analytical skills. I have found it easier to be patient with them and more encouraging than I was before because of learning about Perry's model. I see them as being just a little slower in developing. I find myself working more and more with those students, at least the ones who are committed.
> (David Bishop)

> After the first couple of exams, it wasn't one person, it was dozens that came and said how unfair it was, how it didn't test what was covered in class, this, that and the other. Or they would complain about different aspects of the class, how useless these projects were, etc. Students would come in here angry or they would write angry statements in their portfolios. When they do this I view that as venting, they are at least feeling comfortable enough to speak up. I think that's a sign of the trust that we've built up between us. They wouldn't say anything to me if they thought that it was going to affect their grade. I think they recognize that it's a safe place and so they do it and they're trying to get their thing across to me. I take it that way. I don't necessarily agree with them. I don't necessarily want it, but I try to respond to it in their portfolio in as positive a way as I can. And I point out to them why we design the tests the way we do, why

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> we assign projects, give them a rationale for what we do, try to be as objective when I answer their comments as I possibly can. I'll never answer in anger or in kind if they've been particularly vehement. (Judi McKenna)

In these statements faculty identify several techniques which allow them to alter their emotional experience. For example, by identifying poorly performing and angry students as developing students, faculty are enabled to respond with greater patience and tolerance rather than giving up or acting defensively. Remembering a struggling student who succeeded in turning it around, with a little guidance, kindles hope for those students with whom faculty are presently struggling to lead to self-directedness. Taking deep breaths allows faculty the time and opportunity to question feelings and assess the implications of their reactions.

In my interview with Judi, she gave further clarification and details about her management of feelings.

> For example, I can think of one student in particular who just ranted and raved about how harshly the projects were being graded. He felt like his group had put in a lot of time and really worked hard on it and to get the grade that he got, maybe thirteen or fourteen out of twenty, just didn't reflect how much they'd put into it. He felt that it was "A" work and they weren't getting "A's." He just went on and on. Really just confrontational and "you're doing a crappy job grading our projects. I'm going to give it to you." That's all right. They can vent all they want. When I get really mad about something and think it's unfair my practice is to write a letter and get it all out and crumple it up and throw it in the trash can. These guys haven't learned to do this yet. So they can do that and it's not going to affect how I feel about them as students. They've got to be given that leeway. They're young, impressionable. They're not mature students at all and I think that as the adult leading the class we have to be willing to recognize that and not take offense at it. Of course it can't help but bother me for a short time. (Judi McKenna)

Judi does not want or like students to vent their anger at her. When students are confrontational she says that it bothers her, but only for a short time. Judi does not reveal to the students that she feels bothered by their venting, instead she thanks them for their comments and tries to respond in a rational and positive way. When Judi responds in this manner—when she is feeling another—she is managing her expression of emotion. When she defines the students as young and impressionable, she is defining students in a way which allows her to manage her feelings. As she attends to this definition of a student, Judi's feelings of anger and disappointment, which she considers inappropriate, dissipate.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Thus, faculty not only manage the expression of emotion, but their feeling of emotion. To manage their feelings faculty use strategies of modifying their physical condition (e.g., deep breathing), attending selectively to stimulus (e.g., remembering positive interactions), and redefining the situation by holding particular definitions of students (e.g., when a student is angry it is because he or she is young and young people do not know better, thus the behavior can be overlooked as well as the feels of angry at the offense to their competence and sense of dignity). The management of emotion is an important part of faculty's interaction with students. However, the management of emotion and the presentation of appropriate self-feelings is a major challenge for the faculty because, as David commented to me in the interview, students are astute at understanding human behavior.

> I think probably they can tell if you take your job seriously. They are pretty astute about gut level things. They may not be very effective in the library, or may not be able to process text that are fairly complex, but boy they can process human interactions. (David Bishop)

## Socialization of Emotion

Faculty manage their emotions to model for students particular affective norms. The rules about emotions can be seen in the previous discussion as they pertain to anger, disappointment, frustration, enthusiasm, respect, hope, love, etc. These affective norms and symbols, in conjunction with their appropriate interpretation, are used by the faculty to socialize students into an emotional paradigm which supports or conforms to the model of self-directed learner. Faculty discussed assisting students to develop emotionally towards becoming self-directedness as problematic. The analysis of the data points to a fundamental challenge at the source of this difficulty; faculty's understanding of the relationship between emotion and reason.

The analysis of the data points to faculty's problem of not giving adequate attention to the affective experience or socialization of the students. Rather, faculty are focused largely on the rational. Faculty's bias for the rational follows from their acceptance of the traditional notions about emotion and the assumptions made about the relationship between emotion and reason. It

is on this foundation, this perception of affect, where faculty's efforts at socializing students stumbles. The following discussion relates to both how faculty perceive the relationship between the emotional and the rational as well as to how faculty socialize student emotion.

The traditional model presents emotion as being the opposite of the reason, even that emotionality is in opposition to rationality. Faculty view the emotional experience as often getting in the way of rational experience. Judi's comments, about students who attack her professionalism because of their poor grades, reveal this idea. Judi talks about students being upset. Students take these feelings and direct them—unjustly— toward her. The students' emotions gets in the way of their thinking. She calmly points out to students the reasons that lay behind the grading and hopes that they calm down enough to recognize the legitimacy of her grading practices and of their grades.

Other faculty also talked in ways which provided evidence of thinking about emotions according to this model. David told me a story and its message, which he tells his students. He tells this story when he finds that students are tuning out, acting defensively, or when a particularly controversial topic is going to be covered. David is socializing the emotion of his students according to the traditional model in telling this story.

> When I first came to ISU, when the Vietnamese war was still on, there was a lot of anti-war sentiment on campus. I think a lot of it was superficial, well some of it was. I ran into a lot of political talk in my classes. People for the most part, myself included, knew next to nothing about the war. . . I had a very quiet student in a class who eventually spoke out, exploded, in fact. He'd been a Ranger. He had done two tours back to back and had been out in the bush. His job was that of an assassin. He made me feel like I had no right to speak on the subject. His knowledge was of a different kind and depth. Yet his views were also inadequate, sort of visceral, emotional knowledge of the war. He could not see the political issues, the global context, because of the power of that experience. (David Bishop)

Statements and stories such as this are repeatedly told to students. Thus, students are explicitly aware that not only can the emotional overpower the rational, but the emotional is not adequate for knowing.

Further, faculty also speak to students explicitly about emotion as leading to both poor decisions and bizarre, or irrational behavior. In the interviews I was told the following:

> I mean we tend to see logic from our own perspective and progress from our own perspective and that may not always be right. I think more and more in higher education we need to get into other people's shoes and walk around a bit. We are not a citadel and we are not isolated. The best we can do and the best we should do is to help students make decisions by learning to analyze things in some sort of objective fashion and not coming just to the emotional conclusion. (Nathan Nealy)

> That's why you start at the beginning, getting the person out of the work. You have to get the student leaving the lab saying, "I'm glad you were here. You made contributions here, here and here. But that weighing that you did was just plain wrong. You really blew it on that. Now what are you going to do about it?" So that the ego is not involved with the work. I'm not sure this is ever attained. I've run into scientists where the slightest suggestion that their work wasn't perfect sends them into orbit. One shoots for this because it's the only way you can get them to analyze their own work. If you can just get the ego out of the work. Then you have to carry this over to other people's work too. (John Wheeler)

I heard statements like these being told to the students at major junctions in the semester, such as at the introduction or conclusion of course segments; with brief reminders alluding to this perspective sprinkled throughout the semester.

Additionally, much of the emotional management faculty use attempts to neutralize their feelings. This is the implicit side of the socialization coin. Faculty are not telling students emotions get in the way of reason, instead they act in ways which hide their feelings. For example, when Judi responds in her calm and "as positively as possible" way to the emotionally upset student, she is modeling the neutral, non-emotional, or rational response. The following message is sent to students: when feelings of discomfort, upset, anger or stress are experienced because of poor grades or high work standards, instead of reacting in an emotional manner, one should calm down and examine the situation more carefully. The message for the students is that they should explore the situation non-emotionally to reach a legitimate or worthy conclusion. The non-emotional response is equated to the rational response.

Another example of this implicit socialization occurs when faculty discuss controversial issues dispassionately. Faculty present and work through the various positions and model the rational thinking process. When a position is advocated, the claim being made is that the particular conclusion is based on reason rather than emotion. Often, unless told otherwise, the message to students is they should accept the advocated position because it is based on reason. A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

message is also given that students should learn to use reason for making decisions rather than rely on their emotions.

This display of emotional neutrality by the faculty also protects against students adopting particular stances on issues because they are responding to the emotional component of the professor's delivery, rather than the rational argument of the presentation. Several of the faculty alluded to this when they talked about not wanting students to simply accept what is said in class. This became clear as I listened to Eliza state the following.

> Sometimes I teach things that I don't agree with, that I may hate. I just don't want my students to copy that feeling without any broader understanding. There's the work of this designer which I really don't like. I really hate it. I still hate it, but I teach students about it. (Eliza Montgomery)

Furthermore, self-directedness requires one to be open to new questions and possibilities. Faculty see emotion, particularly strong emotion, as closing the avenues of investigation. Faculty want students to arrive at their own opinion on the issues based on a reasonable examination of the information. They conceive of emotion as largely blocking, disrupting, or closing that investigation.

This does not mean all deliveries and presentations by the faculty are emotionally neutral. In fact, many lectures are given with enthusiasm and excitement by the faculty. Enthusiasm and love of learning are considered important qualities of self-directedness. These emotions provide not only motivation, but stimulate the individual to take the time to adequately investigate—from multiple perspectives—a particular problem before arriving at a reasonable position. However, faculty may deliver a lecture with passion and still convey the messages of the emotional being inadequate, disruptive, and secondary to the rational.

For example, one lecture that I observed Eliza give on Postmodern design and art contained several visual images which were sexually explicit, some might even say they were offensive. These images were presented in the context of the course; for threaded throughout the semester were issues pertaining to identity, viewer, representation, and freedom of expression. Several of the images presented messages about the representation of women's sexuality, several were about

men's sexuality, and several were about children's sexuality. Eliza had discussed with me previously how she was going to approach the two photographs depicting children's sexuality.

"Personally," Eliza had told me in the interview, "I find these photographs repulsive, I feel uncomfortable showing them to students." Eliza also expressed in the interview and course discussions with students throughout the semester her unwavering support of the concept of freedom of expression. Eliza possesses strong feelings about the photographs, showing them to the students, and the concepts and issues raised in the photos pertaining to free expression.

She presented the photos in the following manner. The slides were beamed onto the screen as she walked over to one side of the room and put on a red hat. She began a short dialogue listing all the arguments in favor of the artist's message and of his right to present his message in such a manner. Then she walked over to the other side of the room and put on a black hat and condemned both the message and the presentation of the message. She presented arguments for censorship. She passionately and eloquently presented both sides of the issue. After she finished, Eliza opened the lecture up for comments and a healthy discussion ensued. I am quite sure most students were unaware these pictures were offensive to her or that she felt uncomfortable with the images. It was only as Eliza requested the participation of the class in the discussion that she revealed her feelings about these photos. As the discussion continued she argued for the right of this photographer to express himself in this manner. The relevance of this episode to this discussion is that she gave both speeches with equal zeal. The basis of the arguments and decisions to accept the position of finding the artwork offensive verses not offensive, and the position of supporting freedom of expression verses censorship can only be grounded in reason. For it was not emotion which differentiates her stance taken on the two bipolar positions.

Eliza's management of emotion emphasized her deference to the rational over her emotional reaction, as she was able to present both sides of the argument with an equivalent level of emotional commitment. Further, Eliza's position on these issues appeared to be not based on

an emotional reaction, it was based on rational thinking. Nor was she justifying or arguing for students to accept her position on these issues based on emotion. While the presentation was emotional, it was not a presentation to the emotions.

Clearly the faculty explicitly and implicitly socialize students in ways that identify the influence of the traditional paradigm. The taken-for-granted understanding of the faculty is of people thinking and acting rationally if they keep their emotions out of the way of reason. Emotions are not trustworthy. Emotions are disruptive. Emotions are frightening.

> While there are a series of issues that they need to encounter profoundly in college, I do not assume that I have to be the totality of that encounter. And I don't measure the depth of the encounter by the emotional sparks that there are. I do not trust emotion. (David Bishop)

> I think we [faculty] don't talk about that [emotion] because it's a little more frightening. I think about being "on," having to perform or my students wanting to perform or being afraid to and that's why they don't speak, all those issues. That's a lot more than the information you're trying to deliver, that you're responsible for because you're trying to deal with it and whatever. It's frightening. I think a lot of professors have a built-in denial system. Sometimes in conversations with colleagues it seems to me that they just don't notice that energy level and they don't think about emotions because it is somehow easier. The performance is the hard work and evaluating that continually. So I think we tend not to think of it that way. (Kim Gardner)

The traditional model rejects and discounts the emotional and its contribution to the rational. This discounting of the emotional explains an important problem faculty have in socializing student emotion.

## Interpretation

The analysis revealed that despite the persuasiveness, acceptance, and influence of the traditional emotional paradigm, another kind of understanding of emotions is evident in the faculty's interaction with students. Faculty may not recognize it as such, but when they manage their emotions they are legitimating another paradigm of emotion, even while they are going about thinking, talking, and acting in ways that support the traditional model. The constructionist model views the emotional not in opposition to the rational, but rather in partnership with the rational. To think and act rationally, one must feel. For the constructionists there are appropriate emotions and inappropriate emotions. When an individual experiences a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

feeling, the determination of its appropriateness is a judgment based on the context of the situation. The key for the constructionists is the social actors not only attend to the same stimulus or symbols but share a similar interpretation of those symbols. Socialization of the emotions becomes critical for the maintenance of social interaction.

The analysis of the data found while the faculty predominantly accept and treat emotions according to the traditional psychological model, with its problematizing aspects, the constructionist model surfaces in ways which aid the faculty. After David had spoken to his skepticism of emotion he followed it up by saying,

> And so I don't like embarrassing students at all, and I don't like to be socially embarrassed myself. I try to provide a class that is friendly and supportive where things can be talked about. I don't want me or my students to be submitted to a shouting match. That is not the sign that they have really got it. I think that its a sign that you've lost control, that you've failed to maintain the decorum of the classroom.
>
> (David Bishop)

By trying to create a friendly and supportive environment, where students are not subjected to shouting (a symbol of anger or frustration), David is articulating a model that recognizes appropriate and inappropriate emotions for learning. As soon as he makes this recognition, emotions become socially defined, experienced, constructed, and lived. The traditional model argues for a largely affectiveless learning environment so that the emotional will not interfere with the rational. In this statement, David indicates he does not really want an affectiveless or emotion-free learning. David sees caring as an important part of learning.

Caring, enthusiasm, and love of learning become important emotions for the emergence of self-directedness. Returning to the example found in Eliza's presentation containing the photographs of the nude children, some interesting insights are gained when approaching what occurred from the constructionist framework. Remember that Eliza was uncomfortable. Although I did not ask the students, it was clear by the silence in the room, the eye movements, and later the comments that students made in the discussion, that they felt uncomfortable with these images. Eliza was using positive emotions—enthusiasm, caring and love for learning—to counter the discomfort that she and the students were feeling. In other words, by her example and confession

of her own discomfort she was offering for students another definition of how to behave given these kinds of feelings. The model for students which was offered contains the notion that learning requires facing issues and experiences that may cause discomfort. A self-directed learner does not turn away or reject offhand issues that may produce feelings of discomfort.

I also observed, particularly during the first several weeks, Judi telling students it was "okay" to feel uncomfortable or nervous about coming up to the front of the class. But then she went on to say "This is a learning opportunity. You don't need to feel embarrassed if you make a mistake. We are all learning and to learn you have to be able to make mistakes." And slowly the students responded. By the second midterm Judi's class was extremely interactive, with many students volunteering and participating in class. Judi defined the situation and redefined for students how they were to interpret their feelings of nervousness to act appropriately.

As I listened and observed it became clear faculty see self-directedness as something which generates discomfort in students. This is a major concern in the literature. Consensus in the literature has yet to be reached, but most often discussion talks about raising or lowering the discomfort level (Meacham, 1995). Several faculty talked about such techniques.

> I think culturally perhaps we tend to move away from discomfort or conflict or tension as quickly as possible and the difficulty in a classroom, if it's requesting or encouraging students to examine value systems and constructs of knowledge, etc., is that it can be uncomfortable for students. I think that the place in which we are temporarily uncomfortable or intellectually and affectively note some discomfort, is the place where we do our best learning, where we can hear differently or see differently. (Kim Gardner)

Kim went on to discuss how she raises or lowers the discomfort level by negotiating the amount of reading, providing students opportunities for extra credit, and by getting students together during class time to discuss their projects. She also told how she presents alternative perspectives, but if she feels students are too uncomfortable, she backs off and respects their opinions. Other faculty also talked about such strategies.

However, the analysis showed these faculty do more than attempt to negotiate the discomfort level by raising or lowering the levels of stress. Most importantly, faculty are redefining how students interpret the experience of discomfort. In other words, faculty perceive self-directedness, particularly critical self-reflection, as being uncomfortable, but an important and necessary part of self-directedness. Therefore, the model of self-directed learning embraces rather than rejects the affective experience of discomfort. Discomfort is a sign of learning. Some faculty were more engaged than others in both modeling the management of emotion and explicitly identifying for students the affective norms which are part of self-directness. When faculty display appropriate emotions and talk with students about appropriate and inappropriate emotions, they identify both the important symbols and the interpretation of those symbols needed for self-directedness.

## Summary and Conclusion

Faculty were found to view emotions as biological, disruptive, anti-rational, inadequate for knowing, and leading to poor decisions or irrational behavior. Faculty's perspective of affect orients their attention on the rational experience of students, to the exclusion of students' emotional encounters in the classroom. The problem for faculty of holding such a perspective is that it discounts an important source of information and critical component of the socialization involved in becoming self-directed.

Further, faculty's perspective of the emotional as being in opposition to the rational structures how they express their emotions in their interactions with students, as well as how they attempt to socialize the emotions of students. Faculty manage their emotions to model for

students the affective norms of self-directedness. In other words, there are affective norms ensuing from self-directedness which are used to shape feeling and behavior. Affective norms in faculty-student interaction were identified as they pertain to anger, disappointment, frustration, discomfort, enthusiasm, respect, hope, and love. Thus, even as faculty go about thinking, talking, and acting in ways which socialize students to view emotions as biological and individual, they are also using a cognitive and social model of emotions. An interpretation of the ways that this constructionist model aides the faculty has been explored.

Specifically, an important affective symbol in becoming self-directed is the feeling of discomfort. The interpretation of this symbol for students is that they are seeing a different perspective and thus they should continue their investigation to understand what it is they are learning from this new point of view. The self-directed learner possesses enthusiasm and love for learning. These emotions act to motivate the individual to continually and critically search for information, knowledge, and answers to questions despite difficulties and discomfort. Thus, emotions hold an important place in instruction.

Based on this summary, the paper returns to its originating purpose. The view of the non-emotional as being equivalent to the rational is inadequate, but so too is the anything goes of unhindered emotional expression. There is use and value in attending to emotion in the classroom by the faculty. Both explicit and implicit use of emotional cues, language, and feelings should be used and attended to by the faculty. Emotional norms—made-up of affective symbols and the interpretation—delineate appropriate and inappropriate ways for emotions to be displayed and felt in the classroom. The strategies identified by the faculty for managing their feelings provide methods that may be useful to those struggling to find a "good way of dealing with it."

**References**

Adams, H. (1976). *The Academic Tribes* . New York: Liveright.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(1), pp. 88-115.

Astin, A. W. (1992). The unrealized potential of American higher education. *Innovative Higher Education, 17*(2), pp. 95-114.

Averill, J. R. (1980). A constructivist view of emotion. In R. Plutchik, & H. Kellerman (Eds.), *Emotion: Theory, Research, and Experience*. (pp. 305-339). New York: Academic Press.

Brookfield, S. D. (1990). *The Skillful Teacher: On Technique, Trust, and Responsiveness in the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christensen, C. R., Garvin, D. A., & Sweet, A. (Eds.). (1991). *Education for Judgment: The Artistry of Discussion Leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Crooks, S. (1995). Developing the critical attitude. *Teaching Philosophy, 18*(4), pp. 313-325.

Davis, J. R. (1993). *Better Teaching, More Learning: Strategies for Success in Postsecondary Settings*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Denzin, N. K. (1984). *On Understanding Emotion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Denzin, N. (1990). On understanding emotion: The interpretive-cultural agenda. In T. D. Kemper (Ed.), *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*. (pp. 85-115). New York: State University of New York.

Fried, J. (1993). Bridging emotion and intellect: Classroom diversity in process. *College Teaching, 41*(4), pp. 123-128.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence* . New York: Bantam Books.

Grow, G. (1991). Teaching learners to be self-directed. *Adult Education Quarterly, 41*(1), pp. 125-149.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hochschild, A. R. (1989). *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking-Penguin.

Jacobs, J. (1994). Values, naturalism, and teaching the nature of values. *Teaching Philosophy, 17*(1), pp. 17-28.

Johnson, J. M. (1975). *Doing Field Research*. New York: Free Press.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings*. San Francisco: Wadsworth.

Lowman, J. (1984). *Mastering the Techniques of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mann, R. D., et al. (1970). *The College Classroom: Conflict, Change, and Learning*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

McCarthy, E. D. (1989). Emotions are social things: An essay in the sociology of emotions. *Sociology of Emotions, 9*, pp. 51-72.

Mead, G. H. (1964). *On Social Psychology: Selected Papers with an Intro by Anselm Strauss* . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Momeyer, R. W. (1995). Teaching ethics to student relativists. *Teaching Philosophy, 18*(4), pp. 301-311.

Ortony, A., Clore, G. L., & Collins, A. (1988). *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(1), pp. 23-37.

Rosaldo, M. Z. (1984). Toward an anthropology of self and feeling. In R. A. Shweder, & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. (pp. 137-157). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shott, S. (1979). Emotion and social life: A symbolic interactionist analysis. *American Journal of Sociology, 84*(6), pp. 1317-1334.

Solomon, R. C. (1976). *The Passions*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Solomon, R. C. (1980). Emotions and choice. In A. O. Rorty (Ed.), *Explaining Emotions*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Spradley, J. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sutton, R. I. (1991). Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, pp. 245-268.

Tavris, C. (1989). *Anger: The Misunderstood Emotion*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Thoits, P. A. (1989). The sociology of emotions. *Annual Review of Sociology, 15*, pp. 317-342.

Tolich, M. (1993). Alienating and liberating emotions at work: Supermarket clerks' performance of customer service. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 22*(3), pp. 361-381.

Wharton, A. S. (1993). The affective consequences of service work. *Work and Occupations, 20*(2), pp. 205-232.

Wilshire, B. (1990). *The Moral Collapse of the University*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. (1993). *An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education*. University of Wisconsin.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wolcott, H. F. (1995). *The Art of Fieldwork*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.